

American driving public cannot afford any more wasted time.

Don't we think these corporations that are causing this outrageous situation that has killed seven people in the United States and severely injured dozens more—don't we think that they ought to be held accountable? If executives at Takata knew about their defective products, if they knew that and did nothing, or worse, if they covered it up, then they ought to go to jail. Not another fine, not another settlement, somebody ought to be going to jail. Lying about a danger of this magnitude is a criminal act.

We have a crisis of consumer confidence in the vehicle-safety area. Certainly that has been demonstrated with these Takata airbags.

What about General Motors' misinformation, lack of information, and outright deception about the defective ignition switches? And now what about Volkswagen's deliberate efforts to lie about—and to cover up—emissions from its diesel vehicles?

A few weeks ago I sent a letter to Chairwoman Edith Ramirez of the Federal Trade Commission, asking them to crack down on Volkswagen's unfair and deceptive practices in connection with its "clean diesel" vehicle claims, and today I received a response. The Chairwoman of that Commission told me they are investigating the claims against Volkswagen, along with the Department of Justice and the Environmental Protection Agency. In her response she said: "No reasonable consumer would knowingly purchase a vehicle that he or she could not legally drive."

I agree. Don't we all agree? So it is time to get tough and to hold these folks and these corporations accountable.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING BILL

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, today I rise as a staunch supporter of every American's right to privacy. I rise because, like many Montanans, I have grave concerns about whether my personal information gets handed over to the government.

As the Senate debates the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, I start by acknowledging the inherent conflict between the right to privacy and national security. Some folks want to pretend this conflict doesn't exist, but it does. Ask yourself this: How do we stop cyber terrorists from crashing our networks, stealing our personal infor-

mation, and throwing our entire economy into a tailspin—an economy that is dependent on technology? How do we do this without violating your right to privacy and mine? How do we do this without giving the Federal Government far-reaching authority to share the personal information of law-abiding citizens?

These are tough questions that require thoughtful answers, and I do believe we can answer them. I do believe we can strike a balance that protects our right to privacy and protects our Nation from threats. That is why I want to offer my support for a couple of amendments sponsored by colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

The first amendment, from Senators FLAKE and FRANKEN, provides the necessary 6-year sunset for this legislation. That means that in 6 years Congress would be forced to have another conversation about how we ensure every American's right to privacy while also ensuring our national security. These conversations are incredibly important, and we should revisit them often. We should revisit them often because we know that a government unchecked is dangerous. In a world where technology changes faster than our laws, we cannot and must not give corporations and the Federal Government unbridled authority for generations to come.

We already know that several Federal agencies have engaged in invasive surveillance of law-abiding Americans. They have utilized intrusive monitoring techniques—tracking our phone calls, listening to our conversations, gathering storehouses of personal information. They have done this in the name of the PATRIOT Act, one of the worst pieces of legislation ever to come out of this body. It took a long time for those agencies to own up to the fact that certain operations were far bigger in scope than what they had led Congress or the American public to believe.

The best thing we can do to try to prevent a repeat of those mistakes is to pass the amendment offered by my good friend Senator WYDEN. This amendment would improve cyber security and better protect privacy by reducing the amount of unnecessary personal information that would be shared about a possible cyber security threat. It seems like common sense to me, and I certainly appreciate Senator WYDEN championing this issue.

As Members of Congress we all took an oath to the people of this Nation to protect them from enemies both foreign and domestic, and we should not give up our ability to check and balance this administration or for that matter the next one. That is why the Flake-Franken amendment and the Wyden amendment are so critical, and I urge my colleagues to support them when they come to the floor.

With that, Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I came back today and had really good news over the weekend. I think a lot of people have gotten together on both sides, in the House and the Senate, to do what we are supposed to be doing.

I often refer to that old instrument called the Constitution, which says there are two main things we are supposed to be doing here: One is defending America, and the other is building roads and bridges. That is what we are supposed to be doing.

The Presiding Officer has heard me say before that my top priority as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee is, and continues to be, passing a long-term highway reauthorization bill. The last one we passed was in 2005. I was proud to be the author of it at that time. It expired in 2009. Since that time, we have not had anything except short-term extensions. I have to remind my conservative friends, because I am a conservative, that the conservative position is to have a long-term reauthorization bill, because the short-term costs about 30 percent off the top. As a result, the industry stakeholders and local government leaders have lost faith in Congress's ability to provide funding certainty to maintain and advance our surface transportation and infrastructure. Ranking Member BARBARA BOXER and I have been fighting for a long period of time to change this and reverse the trend of wasteful short-term patches.

On June 24, our committee—and this is very unusual for this to happen. Our committee unanimously voted to advance to the Senate the DRIVE Act, which is a 6-year reauthorization bill. In July, the Senate gave strong bipartisan support by a vote of 65 to 34, a 2-to-1 majority. Again, this is not something that normally happens with a major piece of legislation. It also included contributions from the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate Banking Committee, so it is not just the Environment and Public Works Committee. Other committees have parts of this legislation also.

The Senate worked hard across party lines to put forward a solution for our Nation's roads and bridges. We ended the summer by passing yet another short-term patch in order to give more time for the House to join our efforts. Unfortunately, we are now 3 days away